

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-44 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Applicant herein amends the independent claims to recite obtaining further data comprising prior call information on a caller in dependence on the intercepted data.² No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Voit et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,805,682; hereinafter “Voit”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part:

wherein the intercept unit obtains further data comprising
prior call information on a caller in dependence on the intercepted
data.

Thus, independent claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, obtaining further data comprising prior call information. The other independent claims require similar features.

Regarding the claimed “further data” feature, the Examiner asserts that Voit discloses a line information database (LIDB) which is used to “get the user’s name and other information associated with the with the user’s calling number, the call related information being the same information typically provided in a conventional telephone caller ID service [col. 10, lines 19-29].³

² Support for this claim amendment can be found, for example, in paragraph [0032] of the specification.

³ See Office Action, paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7.

However, the cited portion of Voit fails to teach or suggest using further data comprising prior call information, as required by claim 1. Indeed, Voit is silent on any such feature.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that Voit fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 1, and that independent claim 1 is therefore patentable over Voit for at least these reasons.

Further, Applicant submits that independent claims 19, 29, 30 and 39 each recite similar features, and thus, are also patentable over Voit for reasons analogous to those stated above with regard to independent claim 1.

Finally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-18, 20-28, 31-39 and 40-44 are also patentable over Voit, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on independent claims 1, 19, 29, 30 and 39, respectively.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
Application No. 09/917,896

Docket No. Q64011

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Myndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 2, 2006